

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_92531
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF ISLAMIC BANKS USING THE ISLAMICITY PERFORMANCE INDEX APPROACH ON ISLAMIC BANKS IN INDONESIA AND MALAYSIA
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The theme is an interesting one and the author has made a comparative study of Islamic Banks in two countries against an established Islamicity scale. The charts and tables suitably illustrate the analysis. However, there are a few issues which need to be resolved before publication.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Author claims that the study is a qualitative one, hence sample selection and other necessary details of methodology are not needed. I must emphasize that a qualitative study does not mean that no methodology is followed. For example, it is necessary for the Author to explain why he selected a sample of 68 banks? Why the number of sample banks is different in each country? Are these the largest Islamic Banks or the only ones for which he could get access to data or some other reason?</li> <li>2. The study is not purely descriptive as statistical tests have been used to verify the findings. Hence it is more a kind of mixed method research. In such cases, it is extremely important to select a representative sample, and explain why it is representative of Islamic banks in the countries chosen. If the selection was done for convenience, this is a shortcoming of the study and must be acknowledged.</li> <li>3. As the terminology used in the paper will be unfamiliar to readers from non-Islamic countries, I would suggest that the Author adds one page or a table explaining these terms before starting the analysis. While explanations have been given for most of the terms used, there are still a number of terms, which remain unexplained like "Halal and Non-Halal income", "Quard", "mudharabah and musyarakah contracts", etc.</li> <li>4. It is also not possible to compare the results of this study with other such studies, unless your sample selection is correctly done.</li> <li>5. All the results are compared to Sadiya's analysis alone. As the Author has listed a number of references, why does he not cited other research studies which have similar or dis-similar findings.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Minor editing is required before publication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nira Ramachandran</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>